

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.**



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/916,958	07/27/2001	Kenton T. Dalton	L13.12-0158/01/153	9325

7590 07/16/2004

Leo J. Peters
LSI LOGIC CORPORATION
M/S D-106
1551 McCarthy Boulevard
Milpitas, CA 95035

EXAMINER

SHRADER, LAWRENCE J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 07/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/916,958

Applicant(s)

DALTON, KENTON T.

Examiner

Lawrence Shrader

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers


- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 8 – 10, 12, 14; and 15 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Draper et al., U.S. Patent 6,604,236.

In regard to claim 8:

"a) providing a computer containing a software tool that maps directory references between the first computer-readable directory structure and a second computer-readable directory structure by source name;

Draper discloses a map file referencing the differences between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 22 – 29).

b) input the first computer file to the computer;

Draper discloses that the first directory system is stored (Abstract).

c) identifying source names in a line of the first computer file that is referenced by the software tool;

Draper discloses a map file referencing the differences between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 22 – 29).

Art Unit: 2124

d) for each identified source name, changing the associated directory reference from the first computer-readable directory structure to the second computer-readable directory structure."

See Draper column 1, line 49 to column 2, line 6.

In regard to claim 9, incorporating the rejection of claim 8:

"...wherein step (c) is performed by steps of:

c1) comparing the source names in the line to the source names identified by the software tool, and

c2) selecting the directory reference in the first computer file associated with each source name the line that matches a source name identified by the software tool."

Draper discloses comparing a first and second computer-readable directory and identifying the difference between the two directories (column 1, line 49 – column 2, line 6).

In regard to claim 10, incorporating the rejection of claim 9:

"...including the steps of:

e) storing the line containing a changed directory reference to a second computer file, and

f) repeating steps (c) and (d) for each line in the first computer file."

Draper discloses a map file referencing the differences between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 22 – 29).

In regard to claim 12, incorporating the rejection of claim 8:

"...including steps of:

e) storing the line containing a changed directory reference to a second computer file, and

f) repeating steps (c) and (d) for each line in first computer file."

Draper discloses a map file referencing the differences between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 22 – 29). See also Draper column 1, line 49 to column 2, line 6.

In regard to claim 14, incorporating the rejection of claim 8:

"...wherein the second computer file overwrites the first computer file."

Draper discloses that a new version of the directory structure is stores replacing the old structure (column 1, line 64 to column 2, line 6).

In regard to claim 15:

"first computer readable program code for causing the computer identify source names in each line of the first computer-readable file; and

second computer readable program code for causing the computer change the directory reference associated with each source name from the first computer-readable directory structure to the second computer-readable directory structure."

Claim 15 (a computer-readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 8 (a corresponding process).

In regard to claim 16, incorporating the rejection of claim 15:

"...wherein the computer readable program includes computer readable data representing source names in the first and second computer-readable directory structures, and the first computer readable program code includes:

Art Unit: 2124

computer readable program code causing the computer compare the source names in the line to the source names represented by the computer readable data, and

computer readable program code for causing the computer to select the directory reference in the first computer-readable file associated with each identified source name in the line."

Claim 16 (a computer-readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 9 (a corresponding process).

In regard to claim 17, incorporating the rejection of claim 16:

"...wherein the computer readable program includes:

computer readable program code for causing the computer to store the line containing a changed directory reference to a second computer-readable file."

Claim 17 (a computer-readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 10 (a corresponding process).

In regard to claim 18, incorporating the rejection of claim 17:

"...wherein the computer readable program includes:

computer readable program code for causing the computer to output the second computer-readable file as defining the integrated circuit in the second computer-readable directory structure."

Claim 18 (a computer-readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 11 (a corresponding process).

In regard to claim 19, incorporating the rejection of claim 15:

"...wherein the computer readable program includes:

computer readable program code for causing the computer store the line containing a changed directory reference second computer-readable file."

Claim 19 (a computer-readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 10 (a corresponding process).

In regard to claim 20, incorporating the rejection of claim 19:

"...wherein the computer readable program includes:

computer readable program code for causing the computer to output the second computer-readable file as defining integrated circuit in the second computer-readable directory structure."

Claim 20 (a computer-readable medium) is rejected for the same corresponding reasons put forth in the rejection of claim 13 (a corresponding process).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper et al., U.S. Patent 6,604,236 (hereinafter referred to as Draper) in view of Tabloski, Jr. et al., U.S. Patent 5,999,729 (hereinafter referred to as Tabloski).

Draper discloses a tool to adjust files in updating directories:

In regard to claim 1:

"a) comparing the first and second computer-readable directories identify differences between first and second computer-readable directory structures;"

Draper discloses comparing a first and second computer-readable directory and identifying the difference between the two directories (column 1, line 49 – column 2, line 6).

"b) generating computer-readable map file containing plurality items, each referencing difference between the first and second computer-readable directory structures by an associated source name;"

Draper discloses a map file referencing the differences between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 22 – 29).

c) sorting the items of the mapping file an ordered list based on the source names;

Draper does not explicitly disclose sorting based on source names. However, Tabloski discloses sorting by source names (column 16, lines 4 – 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the generation of a map file with the sorting of information in a source file because the source file contains the basis information for updating the new version as taught by Draper at column 2, lines 1 – 6.

d) for each source name, generating computer-readable code representing difference between the first and second computer-readable directory structures associated with the respective source name; and

Draper discloses a computer readable code representing the difference between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 29 – 39).

e) generating the tool based on the computer-readable codes.

Draper discloses generation of a table to be used in identifying data in order to adjust the old version of an existing directory to create a new one (column 1, lines 49 – 64).

In regard to claim 2, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...wherein step (c) includes steps of:

c1) sorting the source names by length, and

c2) after step (c1), alphanumerically sorting source names of equal length."

Draper does not explicitly disclose sorting based on source names. However, Tabloski discloses sorting by source names (column 16, lines 4 – 7) and additionally discloses the developer can indicate other sort characteristics (column 14, lines 26 – 29). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the generation of a map file with the sorting of information in a source file because the source file contains the basis information for updating the new version as taught by Draper at column 2, lines 1 – 6.

In regard to claim 3, incorporating the rejection of claim 2:

"...further including after step (c) and before step (d)

f) parsing the source names."

Draper discloses that the file system hierarchy is identified and segmented (parsed) column 4, lines 7 – 27).

In regard to claim 4, incorporating the rejection of claim 3:

"...further including steps of:

f) packaging the tool with the second computer-readable directory structure."

Art Unit: 2124

Draper discloses that the tools to adjust the directory files may be stored on the target system (See Abstract).

In regard to claim 5, incorporating the rejection of claim 2:

"...further including steps of:

f) packaging the tool with the second computer-readable directory structure."

Draper discloses that the tools to adjust the directory files may be stored on the target system (See Abstract).

In regard to claim 6, incorporating the rejection of claim 1:

"...further including after step (c) and before step (d)

f) parsing the source names."

Draper discloses that the file system hierarchy is identified and segmented (parsed) column 4, lines 7 – 27).

In regard to claim 7, incorporating the rejection of claim 6:

"...further including steps of:

f) packaging the tool with the second computer-readable directory structure."

Draper discloses that the tools to adjust the directory files may be stored on the target system (See Abstract).

Art Unit: 2124

5. Claims 11 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Draper et al., U.S. Patent 6,604,236 (hereinafter referred to as Draper) in view of Yazdani, U.S. Patent 6,625,597.

In regard to claim 11, incorporating the rejection of claim 10:

"...including

g) output the second computer file as defining the integrated circuit the second computer-readable directory structure.

Draper discloses a map file referencing the differences between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 22 – 29), but does not disclose defining an integrated circuit in a computer-readable directory. However, Yazdani discloses defining an integrated circuit in a computer-readable directory (column 1, lines 9 – 20; and column 1, line 59 to column 2, line 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Draper invention that referenced differences between directory structures with the directories defining integrated circuits as taught by Yazdani because the combination provides a means to update the latest design attributes as taught by Yazdani at column 1, lines 29 – 36.

In regard to claim 13, incorporating the rejection of claim 12:

"...including

g) output the second computer file as defining the integrated circuit in the second computer-readable directory structure."

Draper discloses a map file referencing the differences between the first and second directory structures (column 2, lines 22 – 29), but does not disclose defining an integrated circuit

in a computer-readable directory. However, Yazdani discloses defining an integrated circuit in a computer-readable directory (column 1, lines 9 – 20; and column 1, line 59 to column 2, line 14). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the Draper invention that referenced differences between directory structures with the directories defining integrated circuits as taught by Yazdani because the combination provides a means to update the latest design attributes as taught by Yazdani at column 1, lines 29 – 36.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lawrence Shrader whose telephone number is (703) 305-8046. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 08:00-16:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (703) 305-9662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Art Unit: 2124

Lawrence Shrader
Examiner
Art Unit 2124

1 July 2004

Kakali Chaki
KAKALI CHAKI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100